UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,304	08/04/2003	Paulo Pacheco	MWS-030RCE	7963

74321 7590 05/13/2008

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP/THE MATHWORKS
One Post Office Square
Boston, MA 02109-2127

EXAMINER	
WANG, RONGFA PHILIP	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2191	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/13/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/634,304	PACHECO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	PHILIP WANG	2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 February 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5, 8-40, and 42-47* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,8-40 and 42-47* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to amendment filed on 2/13/2008.

2. Per Applicant's request, claims 1, 21, 28, and 37 have been amended.

3. Claims 1-5, 8-40, and 42-47 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 5, 21-23, 26-33, 36-40, and 44-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Denk et al. (US PGPub. No. 2001/0025292) in view of "Digital Filter Solutions" (herein DFS).

As per claim 1,

Denk et al. disclose
A method for implementing and using a filter object which generates an output in response to an input of the filter object, wherein the output of the filter object depends on the input and a state of the filter object, wherein the state of the filter object includes a minimum amount of information necessary to determine the output of the filter object, the method comprising:

- providing the filter object, the filter object being represented by equations performed to generate the output in response to the input of the filter object, the equations including the state of the filter object ([0031], for example, line 8-9, "…can be

represented by the equation…"; See Fig. 3, [0045]); and retaining the state of the filter object, wherein the filter object is implemented and used in a first dynamically typed text-based programming environment, ([0023], "…state-based control…"; since it is state-based, state is retained for processing; [0122], "…LMS adaptive filter…Filter 1700 includes FIR filter taps…"; see Speciation, page 6, 1st paragraph, for example, description of FIR filter; [0070], "The Matlab®…" where it shows a dynamically types text-based programming environment is used to implement such filter.).

Denk et al. do not specifically disclose

- wherein the output of the filter object is determined based on a present input of the filter object and a present state of the filter object, and wherein the state of the filter object contains information about a previous input of the filter object.

However, DFS discloses

- wherein the output of the filter object is determined based on a present input of the filter object and a present state of the filter object, and wherein the state of the filter object contains information about a previous input of the filter object (page 9, Section "Deriving Digital Filters from Z Transforms", 2nd paragraph, "…Z raised to the -1 power refers to a past value…" also see page 10, for implementation of such filter.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of DFS into the teachings of Denk et al. to include wherein the output of the filter object is determined based on a present input of the filter object

and a previous input of the filter object, and wherein the state of the filter object contains information about the previous input of the filter object . The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to be able to implement a digital filter corresponding to Z transform(page 9, Section "Deriving Digital Filters from Z Transforms", 1st paragraph).

As per claim 2,

the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further Denk et al. disclose

- the filter object retains a final value of the state obtained as a result of processing the input of the filter object (See Fig. 3, [0045]).

As per claim 3,

the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated; further Denk et al. disclose

- the final value of the state retained in the filter object is used as an initial value of the state for processing the input of the system (See Fig. 3, [0045]).

As per claim 5,

the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further Denk et al. disclose

the step of presetting the state of the filter object retained in the filter object ([0108], line 13, "…preset the threshold value…").

As per claim 21,

Denk et al. disclose

In a computer-implemented system, a method for generating an output of the system in response to an input of the system, the method comprising the steps of:

- specifying a state of the system that includes a minimum amount of information that is necessary to determine the output of the system; retaining the state of the system in a memory; providing to the system the state of the system retained in the memory; and determining the output of the system depending on the input and a state of the system, ([0023], "…state-based control…"; since it is state-based, state is retained for processing; [0122], "…LMS adaptive filter…Filter 1700 includes FIR filter taps…"; see Speciation, page 6, 1st paragraph, for example, description of FIR filter; [0053], "…Initially, the rounding operand is assigned…in a manner consistent with the reduced precision desired for output signal…"), wherein the method is implemented in a dynamically typed text-based programming environment ([0070], "The Matlab®…" where it shows a dynamically types text-based programming environment is used to implement such filter.).

Denk et al. do not specifically disclose

- wherein the output of the filter object is determined based on a present input of the filter object and a present state of the filter object, and wherein the state of the filter object contains information about the previous input of the filter object.

However, DFS discloses

- wherein the output of the filter object is determined based on a present input of the filter object and a present state of the filter object, and wherein the state of the filter object contains information about the previous input of the filter object (page 9, Section "Deriving Digital Filters from Z Transforms", 2nd paragraph, "…Z raised to the -1 power refers to a past value…" also

see page 10, for implementation of such filter. Page 10 shows state of the filter.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of DFS into the teachings of Denk et al. to include wherein the output of the filter object is determined based on a present input of the filter object and a previous input of the filter object, and wherein the state of the filter object contains information about the previous input of the filter object . The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to be able to implement a digital filter corresponding to Z transform(page 9, Section "Deriving Digital Filters from Z Transforms", 1st paragraph).

As per claim 22,

the rejection of claim 21 is incorporated;

further Denk et al. disclose

- the step of specifying equations that the system performs to generate the output of the system from the input and the state of the system([0031], for example, line 8-9, "…can be represented by the equation…"; Fig. 3).

As per claim 23,

the rejection of claim 21 is incorporated;

further Denk et al. disclose

- the step of controlling the state of the system retained in the memory([0108], "…preset the threshold value…selectable…").

As per claim 26,

the rejection of claim 21 is incorporated;

- It is rejected for the same reason for the rejection claim 2.

As per claim 27,

the rejection of claim 21 is incorporated;

further Denk et al. disclose

- the state of the system provided to the system includes an initial state of the system for processing the input of the system ([0082], line 16-17, "…In this case, the rounding operand would be initially assigned…").

As per claim 28,

Denk et al. disclose

A computer readable medium holding instructions executable in a computer that provides a dynamically typed text-based programming environment ([0070], "The Matlab®…" where it shows a dynamically types text-based programming environment is used to implement such filter.), wherein the computer generates an output of an object in response to an input of the object, comprising:

- providing a class, the object being an instance of the class ([0071]-[0076] for Matlab® code);
- specifying a state of the object that includes a minimum amount of information that is necessary to determine the output of the system, the state being a property of the object; and retaining the state of the object; determining the output of the object depending on the input and the state of the system, ([0023], "…state-based control…";

since it is state-based, state is retained for processing; [0122], "…LMS adaptive filter…Filter 1700 includes FIR filter taps…"; see Speciation, page 6, 1st paragraph, for example, description of FIR filter; [0053], "…Initially, the rounding operand is assigned…in a manner consistent with the reduced precision desired for output signal…").

Denk et al. do not specifically disclose

- wherein the output of the filter object is determined based on a present input of the filter object and a present state of the filter object, and wherein the state of the filter object contains information about a previous input of the filter object.

However, DFS discloses

- wherein the output of the filter object is determined based on a present input of the filter object and a present state of the filter object, and wherein the state of the filter object contains information about a previous input of the filter object (page 9, Section "Deriving Digital Filters from Z Transforms", 2nd paragraph, "…Z raised to the -1 power refers to a past value…" also see page 10, for implementation of such filter.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of DFS into the teachings of Denk et al. to include wherein the output of the filter object is determined based on a present input of the filter object and a previous input of the filter object, and wherein the state of the filter object contains information about the previous input of the filter object . The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to be able to implement a digital filter corresponding to Z transform(page

9, Section "Deriving Digital Filters from Z Transforms", 1st paragraph).

As per claim 29,

the rejection of claim 28 is incorporated;

further Denk et al. disclose

- the step of instantiating the object from the class ([0072]-[0076], for code example.).

As per claim 30,

the rejection of claim 28 is incorporated;

further Denk et al. disclose

- the object includes an adaptive filter object ([0028], "... adaptive filter...").

As per claim 31,

the rejection of claim 30 is incorporated;

further Denk et al. disclose

- the adaptive filter object includes an adapting algorithm that the adaptive filter performs ([0031], "...can be represented by the equation...").

As per claim 32,

the rejection of claim 28 is incorporated;

further Denk et al. disclose

- the object includes a discrete time filter object ([0034], line 9-12, "… signal sample…discrete time sequence of signal samples…").

As per claim 33,

the rejection of claim 28 is incorporated;

further Denk et al. disclose

- the step of controlling properties of the object including the state of the object ([0108], "…preset the threshold value…selectable…").

As per claim 36,

the rejection of claim 28 is incorporated;

further Denk et al. disclose

- the step of providing the class with methods which operate on the object of the class ([0072]-[0075]).

As per claim 37,
A system for implementing a filter object which generates an output in response to an input of the filter object, wherein the output of the filter object depends on the input and a state of the filter object, wherein the state of the filter object includes a minimum amount of information necessary to determine the output of the filter object, the method comprising:

- a memory for retaining the state of the filter object ([0109], line 8, "Memory 1138 can be used…."); and
- a state equation processing unit for generating a new state of the filter object based on the state of the filter object retained in the memory and the input of the filter object (([0023], "…state-based control…"; since it is state-

based, state is retained for processing; [0122], "…LMS adaptive filter…Filter 1700 includes FIR filter taps…"; see Speciation, page 6, 1st paragraph, for example, description of FIR filter; [0031], for example, line 8-9, "…can be represented by the equation…"; See Fig. 3, [0045]); wherein the filter object is implemented and used in a first dynamically typed text-based programming environment ([0070], "The Matlab®…" where it shows a dynamically types text-based programming environment is used to implement such filter.).

Denk et al. do not specifically disclose

- wherein the output of the filter object is determined based on a present input of the filter object and a present state of the filter object, and wherein the state of the filter object contains information about a previous input of the filter object.

However, DFS discloses

- wherein the output of the filter object is determined based on a present input of the filter object and a present state of the filter object, and wherein the state of the filter object contains information about a previous input of the filter object (page 9, Section "Deriving Digital Filters from Z Transforms", 2nd paragraph, "…Z raised to the -1 power refers to a past value…" also see page 10, for implementation of such filter.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of DFS into the teachings of Denk et al. to include wherein the output of the filter object is determined based on a present input of the filter object and a previous input of the filter object, and wherein the state of the filter object contains information

about the previous input of the filter object . The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to be able to implement a digital filter corresponding to Z transform(page 9, Section "Deriving Digital Filters from Z Transforms", 1st paragraph).

As per claim 38,

the rejection of claim 37 is incorporated;

further Denk et al. disclose

- the memory retains the new state of the filter object(See Fig. 3, [0045]).

As per claim 39,

the rejection of claim 38 is incorporated;

further Denk et al. disclose

- the new state retained in the memory is used as a state of the filter object in processing next input of the filter object(See Fig. 3, [0045]).

As per claim 40,

the rejection of claim 37 is incorporated;

further Denk et al. disclose

- an output equation processing unit for generating the output of the filter object based on the state of the filter object retained in the memory and the input of the filter object([0031], for example, line 8-9, "…can be represented by the equation…";).

As per claim 44,

the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further Denk et al. disclose

- the filter object operates on a sample-by-sample, block-by-block or frame-by-frame basis([0034], line 9-12, "… signal sample…discrete time sequence of signal samples…").

As per claims 45, 46, and 47,

- they are rejected for the same reason for the rejection of claim 44.

5. Claims 4, 24, 25, 34, 42, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denk et al. (US PGPub. No. 2001/0025292) in view of "Digital Filter Solutions" (herein DFS) and further in view of Gay (US Patent No. 5,677,951).

As per claim 4,

the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated;

Denk et al./DFS do not specifically disclose

- the step of resetting the state of the filter object retained in the filter object.

However, Gay disclose

- the step of resetting the state of the filter object retained in the filter object (c3, line 5-26, specifically, line 11, "…a restart signal…").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Gay into the teachings Denk et al./DFS to include the step of resetting the state of the filter object retained in the filter object. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to allow the control of the filer by a user as suggested by Gay (c3: 13-15).

As per claims 24, 34 and 42,

- they are rejected for the same reason as claim 4.

As per claim 25,

the rejection of claim 23 is incorporated;

Denk et al./DFS do not specifically disclose

- the state of the system retained in the memory is set to a particular value entered by a user.

However, Gay disclose

- the state of the system retained in the memory is set to a particular value entered by a user(c3, line 5-26, specifically, line 11, "…a restart signal…").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Gay into the teachings Denk et al./DFS to include the state of the system retained in the memory is set to a particular value entered by a user. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to allow the control of the filer by a user as suggested by Gay (c3: 13-15).

As per claim 43,

- It is rejected for the same reason as claim 25.

6. Claims 8-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denk et al. (US PGPub. No. 2001/0025292) in view of "Digital Filter Solutions" (herein DFS) and further in view of "AutoCode Solutions" (herein AutoCode, http://web.archive.org/web/20021120051701/http://www.filter-solutions.com/, dated 2002).

As per claim 8,

the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated;

Denk et al./DFS do not specifically disclose

- the filter object is utilized to generate code to implement a corresponding filter algorithm separate from the filter object implementation.

However, Autocode discloses

- the filter object is utilized to generate code to implement a corresponding filter algorithm separate from the filter object implementation (page 1, 1st para., "…provides the capability to generate C code for your digital filter…").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Autocode into the teachings of Denk et al./DFS to include the filter object is utilized to generate code to implement a corresponding filter algorithm separate from the filter object implementation. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to use the code in standard compatible compiler as suggested by Autocode (p. 1, 1st para.).

As per claim 9,

the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated;

Both Denk et al. do not disclose

- implement a corresponding test bench or filter analysis.

However, DFS discloses

- implement a corresponding test bench or filter analysis (p. 9, "Precision and Quantization", "…provide digital filter test…").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of DFS into the teachings of both Denk et al. to include "implement a corresponding test bench or filter analysis". The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to determine if a digital filter will execute properly on the target environment as suggested by DFS (p. 9, 2nd para., line 4, "..determine if your digital filer will execute properly…).

Denk et al./DFS do not specifically disclose

- the filter object is utilized to generate code to implement a corresponding test bench or filter analysis.

However, Autocode discloses

- the filter object is utilized to generate code (page 1, 1st para., "…provides the capability to generate C code for your digital filter…").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Autocode into the teachings of Denk et al./DFS to include the filter object is utilized to generate code to implement a corresponding filter algorithm separate from the filter

object implementation. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to use the code in standard compatible compiler as suggested by Autocode (p. 1, 1st para.).

As per claim 10,

the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated;

Both Denk et al.do not disclose

- outside the context of a simulation environment on which the filter executes;

However, DFS discloses

- outside the context of a simulation environment on which the filter executes (p. 9, "Precision and Quantization", "…the digital time response from the Filter Solution Filter control panel…provides digital filters and simulation features…on your target processor").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of DFS into the teachings of Denk et al. to include "outside the context of the simulation environment on which the filter executes". The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to determine if a digital filter will execute properly on the target environment as suggested by DFS (p. 9, 2nd para., line 4, "..determine if your digital filer will execute properly…).

Denk et al. do not disclose

- the generated code can be executed, directly or via a suitable compilation process,

However, Autocode dislcoses

- the generated code can be executed, directly or via a suitable compilation process, (p. 1, 1st para., "The code is compatible with any standard C or C++ compiler."),

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Autocode into the teachings of Denk et al. to include the generated code can be executed, directly or via a suitable compilation process, on the host machine. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to use the code in standard compatible compiler as suggested by Autocode (p. 1, 1st para.).

As per claims 11 and 12,

the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated;

further Autocode disclose

- the generated code is a textual language/ a graphical description language (see page 2 code list in text. The examiner asserts that C can be used a graphical description language).

As per claim 13,

the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated;

Both Denk et al. do not disclose

- on the host machine, within the context of a simulation environment on which the filter executes.

However, DFS discloses

- on the host machine, within the context of a simulation environment on which the filter executes (p. 9, "Precision and Quantization", "...the digital

time response from the Filter Solution Filter control panel…provides digital filters and simulation features…").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of DFS into the teachings of Denk et al. to include "on the host machine, within the context of the simulation environment on which the filter executes". The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to determine if a digital filter will execute properly on the target environment as suggested by DFS (p. 9, 2nd para., line 4, "..determine if your digital filer will execute properly…).

Denk et al./DFS do not disclose

- the generated code can be executed, directly or via a suitable compilation process,

However, Autocode dislcoses

- the generated code can be executed, directly or via a suitable compilation process, (p. 1, 1st para., "The code is compatible with any standard C or C++ compiler."),

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Autocode into the teachings of Denk et al./DFS to include the generated code can be executed, directly or via a suitable compilation process, on the host machine. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to use the code in standard compatible compiler as suggested by Autocode (p. 1, 1st para.).

As per claim 14,

the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated;

Both Denk et al. do not disclose

- an embedded system implementation.

However, DFS discloses

further DFS disclose

- an embedded system implementation (p. 9, 2nd para., line 4, "..determine if your digital filer will execute properly on your target system.").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of DFS into the teachings of Denk et al. to include "on the host machine, within the context of the simulation environment on which the filter executes". The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to determine if a digital filter will execute properly on the target environment as suggested by DFS (p. 9, 2nd para., line 4, "..determine if your digital filer will execute properly…).

Denk et al./DFS do not disclose

- the generated code can be executed, directly or via a suitable compilation process,

However, Autocode dislcoses

- the generated code can be executed, directly or via a suitable compilation process, (p. 1, 1st para., "The code is compatible with any standard C or C++ compiler."),

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Autocode into the teachings of Denk et al./DFS to include the generated code can be executed, directly or via a suitable compilation process, on the host machine. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to use the code in standard compatible compiler as suggested by Autocode (p. 1, 1st para.).

As per claim 15,

the rejection of claim 14 is incorporated;

- see reason for rejection of claim 11.

As per claim 16,

the rejection of claim 14 is incorporated;

- see reason for rejection of claim 12.

As per claim 17,

the rejection of claim 14 is incorporated;

further DFS discloses

- the generated code is suitable for use with a software implementation, including use on a general purpose processor, a digital signal processor, or other programmable compute architecture (p. 9, "Precision and Quantization", "… will execute properly on your target processor…").

As per claim 18,

the rejection of claim 14 is incorporated; further Denk et al. disclose

the generated code is suitable for use with a hardware implementation, including use with t least one of a Field Programmable Gate Array (FPGA), Complex Programmable Logic Device (CPLD), and Application Specific Integrated Circuit (ASIC) device, the generate code being written in hardware description language. ([0061], "…Verilog HDL…").

As per claim 19,

the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated;

further Autocode discloses

- the code is a high-level programming language (page 1, 1st para., "…provides the capability to generate C code for your digital filter…").

As per claim 20,

the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated; further Autocode disclose

- the code is a low-level machine or assembly language(page 1, 1st para.,"…The code is compatible with any standard C or C++ compiler".).

7. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Denk et al. (US PGPub. No. 2001/0025292) in view of "Digital Filter Solutions" (herein DFS) further in view of Pickerd (US PGPub. No. 2002/0147554).

As per claim 35,

The rejection of claim 28 is incorporated;

Denk et al/DFS do not specifically disclose

- Inheriting a state property corresponding to the state of the object from an abstract class.

However, Pickerd dislcoses

- Inheriting a state property corresponding to the state of the object from an abstract class ([0140], lines 13-15, "…a subclass object would be created. This would inherit the original abstract class behavior…").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Pickerd into the teachings of Denk et al/DFS to include Inheriting a state property corresponding to the state of the object from an abstract class. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to minimize modification as suggested by Pickerd ([0140], line15, "...minimal...modification...").

Response to Arguments

In the remark,

Applicant argues:

1) Denk and DSF, alone or in combination do not disclose or suggest "retaining the state of the filter object and that the filter object is determined based on a present input of the filter object and a present state of the filter object."

Examiner's response:

1) Denk discloses, [0023] "...state-based control..."; since it is state-based, state is retained for processing; [0122], "...LMS adaptive filter...Filter 1700 includes FIR filter taps..."; see Speciation, page 6, 1st paragraph, for example, description of FIR filter;" In order to be state-based, state information must be retained. Both Denk and the Applicant disclosure disclose implementation of FIR filter. The examiner believes FIR filter retains state information for processing information.

Referring to "Digital Filter Solutions", page 9, Section "Deriving Digital Filters from Z Transforms", 2nd paragraph, "…Z raised to the –1 power refers to a past value…" also see page 10, for implementation of such filter. It clearly supports such limitation.

Applicant points to Specification, page 5, lines 20-25 in support of the newly added limitation in independent claims. On the same page, lines 25-27, "In a linear, time-invariant digital filter, for example, the output of a delay operator(z^{-1}) uniquely specifies the filter condition as any particular time. Thus, the values of the output of a delay (z^{-1}) constitute the state of the filter."

On Applicant's remark, page 9, last paragraph, the Applicant argued that "Z^{-1} refers to one past value of elements of the filter and Z^{-2} refers to two past values of elements of a digital filter rather than a present state of the filter object." It appears the Applicant's reasoning is based on the assumption that past values can not be used to define a current state. However, per Applicant's own disclosure (see previous paragraph), the values of the output of a delay (z^{-1}) constitute the state of the filter.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip Wang whose telephone number is 571-272-5934. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:00 - 4:00PM. Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Wei Zhen/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2191